



#### BOARD MEMBERS

Richard R. Sherman, Ph.D.  
*President*  
Emil R. Rodolfa, Ph.D.  
*Vice-President*  
Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo  
Barbara Cadow, Ph.D.  
Michael Erickson, Ph.D.  
Miguel Gallardo, Psy.D  
James L. McGhee  
Celinda Vasquez

### *In this issue . . .*

#### ADMINISTRATION

Retrospective ..... 1  
View from Within the Board.. 2

#### COMMENTARY

Why Can't You Make an  
Exception for Me? ..... 4

#### ARTICLE

Colleague to Colleague..... 5

#### ENFORCEMENT

Disciplinary Actions ..... 6

Visit us online at:  
[www.psychboard.ca.gov](http://www.psychboard.ca.gov)



## *Letter from the Former Board President*

*By James L. McGhee,  
Public Member*

Having served three terms as President of the California Board of Psychology, I am fully impressed with the commitment my colleagues have shown in serving California consumers, as well as the State's practicing psychologists. In addition, I am equally impressed with the hard work and commitment the staff has demonstrated toward ensuring that the Board is adequately prepared to carry out its responsibilities and duties.

As the outgoing Board President, I want to thank both the Board and the staff for the support that I have received in leading the Board's charge. To that end, I congratulate and lend my full support to the newly elected officers, including the Board's new President, Dr. Richard Sherman, Ph.D., also a Past President of the Los Angeles County Psychological Association.

During the past few years, the Board—as well as the staff—faced the challenge of responding to the continued economic downturn, which directly impacted the State's budget, including a continuation of the State hiring freeze from the previous administration that have left staff vacancies unfilled. Throughout the previous years, the Board was forced to incorporate a 15 percent mandatory reduction in operating expenses. Continual drills and revisions remain the norm during this continual fiscal emergency. As we await a new austere budget under the new administration, certain capital expenditures continue to

be delayed and we expect other cuts in a variety of areas impacting the Board's mission. Despite the cuts, we continued to provide excellent customer service, improved our enforcement and licensing processing times and our complaint process through a revision of in-house procedures. The Board also faced the challenge of responding to the former Governor's proposed consolidation of some of the healing arts Boards. At that time, as President of the Board, I participated in several meetings with the Governor's Office and the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) on the Governor's proposal to consolidate the Board of Psychology with the Board of Behavioral Sciences and the Board of Psychiatric Technicians. I also met with several members of the California Assembly to educate members about the Board's work. I want to thank the California Psychological Association (CPA), Dr. Jo Linder-Crow, CPA's Executive Director, and Dr. Charles Faltz, for their unyielding support in keeping the Board of Psychology as a separate viable entity. The Board is funded through licensing fees, is fiscally responsible and not part of the General Fund. This year, the Board of Psychology had another 2.4 million dollars appropriated from their special fund reserves by the General Fund, to bring the total loaned to the General Fund by the Board of Psychology to a total 8.7 million dollars.

*(continued on page 3)*



## *A View From Within the Board*

Richard Sherman, Ph.D., Board President

Many years ago, the reputation of the California Board of Psychology was one that often engendered much fear and anxiety especially among graduate students and for those psychologists for whom a complaint had been registered. The Board's Executive Officer, staff, and Board Members have worked hard to dispel this impression.

During the last five years, there were from 500 to 800 complaints per year filed with the Board against psychologists and psychological assistants. Of that number, after review and in some instances, formal investigation, on average discipline was determined necessary for only approximately 20 psychologists per year. The most common areas of complaints include those related to unprofessional conduct, unlicensed practice, and criminal conviction. Complaints related to sexual misconduct between psychologists and their patients have decrease significantly over the last several years.

The Board of Psychology has always paid close attention to drug and alcohol abuse by psychologists since this behavior can deleteriously impact the psychologists' ability to work with their clients. Recently with the passage of CA Senate Bill 1441, the Department of Consumer Affairs has developed a set of uniform standards for all the Healing Art Boards (including the Board of Psychology) to follow regarding consequences for those clinicians who are found to be abusing drugs

or alcohol. While the standards have not been implemented yet, it is clear that the consequences for those found abusing drugs or alcohol will be quite rigorous.

In my speaking to psychologists in the community, I understand that despite the Board's definite efforts towards being "user friendly," there is still some distrust of the Board. There was a recent episode in which a number of supervisors and psychology assistants did not properly complete material in a timely manner. The Board's regulations require (and have, since 2005) all interns, with their supervisors, to develop a plan for their supervised professional experience before they start their training, to ensure that the training proceeds along an organized plan that everyone understands and agrees to. Supervised professional experience (SPE) that is accrued according to this plan is a minimum qualification for licensure as a psychologist. Once the plan is done, the Supervisor and the intern attest in writing that this has occurred. This form is then kept by the supervisor and forwarded to the Board with other documentation at the end of the training. Because the Board moved offices during the past year or so, it became obvious to the staff that the form provided, which allows the trainee and supervisor to attest that the plan was developed and reviewed prior to the start of training, which listed the Board's new address, could not have been filled out at the start of the training but at the end. In

addition, not everyone was forthright when asked.

Some might argue that it was no big deal. It was just a form—one more bureaucratic hurdle to jump through towards obtaining one's license. In general, I for one, want to see as much of the process streamlined. However, it is not the form that was or is at issue – it is the SPE, and the quality of it, as a minimum qualification for licensure that is the issue. In addition, there is the expectation that all supervisors will fully follow the rules and regulations in working with their trainees so that a high standard is maintained. If rules and ethical guidelines are not followed during the training phase, then the message is unintentionally given to the trainee regarding "cutting corners" when licensed and working with the public. Yet, the Board and Board Staff did not want to see trainees lose up to 52 weeks of supervised experience due to the supervisors' failure to either complete or maintain the agreement.

After much discussion of the issue, the Board has informed trainees who did not have an SPE agreement signed prior to the start of their experience can ask the board to re-review the potential loss of hours by demonstrating with other evidence that they had, indeed, developed their plan for SPE prior to the start of their training. If you know of someone who has still not appealed, I encourage an appeal to

*(continued on next page)*



## Retrospective *continued from page 1*

### Furloughs and Bare Quorum

State budget cuts adversely threatened to interrupt the Board's ability to carry out its administrative functions, particularly as it related to mandatory furloughs. Although the Board of Psychology's budget is not derived from the General Fund, but rather from licensing and other fees we receive from licensed psychologists, we were included the furlough plan with all other State departments. Starting in February 2009, Board staff was furloughed for two days a month, then increasing to three days a month as of July 2009 and continuing for the next 17 months. Despite the added stress on staff to perform their duties as they faced a reduction of work time and pay and incorporating the additional work due to vacant positions, they continued to provide outstanding customer service.

These staff reductions and reduced work time also found its way to the appointment process for members of the Board. The Board of Psychology is normally comprised of nine members. However, from May 2009 until August 2010, the Board only consisted of two licensed members and three public members. This reduction in the number of Board Members threatened our ability to attain a quorum, which is essential to carry out the board's function in developing policy and carrying out regulations. The lack of appointments led to the rescheduling of one of the four Board meetings, at additional costs to the Board.

For example, some of the Board's committees require a psychologist.

With only two licensed members, we have had to restructure our committees in the interim to eliminate the committees and the Board effectively operates as a committee of the whole. This ensures that the Board is able to perform its tasks in serving the consumer, as well as psychologists across the state, but does not foster the greater public input that the committees enjoyed.

### Teaching and Outreach/Board Visibility

As California's population becomes more diverse, the Board has responded by increasing its outreach and visibility to the State's diverse communities. As Board President, I strongly supported and recommended that we sponsor a diversity conference to educate consumers about their rights as well as the services we provide. Even as we faced budget challenges, I am happy to report that we held our first diversity conference in September 2009 at Pepperdine University, West Los Angeles campus, in conjunction with the California Psychological Association. The conference theme, "Enhancing Services to California Consumers: Strengthening Psychology's Culturally Response Education and Training," drew more than one hundred thirty educators and training directors.

My service as President of the Board of Psychology has been a rewarding experience, both personally and professionally. I thank the Governor for his appointment, and I look forward to continued service as an active public member of the Board.



join the red cross  
[www.redcross.org](http://www.redcross.org)

## A View From Within the Board

*from previous page*

be submitted ASAP. (Please contact the Board office for further details.) In most cases, all training hours were accepted because the trainee and the supervisor could demonstrate that the agreement was in place prior to the start of the experience.

I encourage as many of you as possible to attend a Board meeting, which except for confidential enforcement and credential review sessions, is open to all. Then you can see first-hand the time, care, and thoughtfulness that the Board exercises in reviewing all matters fairly while maintaining its goal of protecting the consumer. In fact, upcoming BOP meetings will be webcast for all interested individuals to view.

The Board is here to serve the public, so feedback is always welcome.



# Why Can't You Make an Exception for Me?

By Bruce W. Ebert, PH.D., J.D., Former Chairperson of the Board of Psychology

*This article initially appeared in the October 1995 Board of Psychology Update.*

*The message is as significant today as it was then.*

Many licensees have asked us to make exceptions for them when a law or regulation has a negative effect upon their license status.

The Board has been begged, threatened with litigation, screamed at, pleaded with, and even harassed to change results ranging from examination failure, credentials determination, or rulings on supervised hours.

The issue is really one of fundamental fairness and justice. We are a Board that exists solely by virtue of the laws that govern it. Our laws and rules are codified for the most part in Section 2900 et. seq. of the Business and Professions Code and Title 16 section 1380 et. seq. of the California Code of Regulations. We must govern based on these laws.

It is the Board's position that everyone should be treated equally in examinations, enforcement, credentials matters, and in every other area of BOP jurisdiction. No one should be given preferential treatment, regardless of the reason. Likewise, no one should be subject to arbitrary decisions that are not based on law. For it is in the equal administration of the law that true justice occurs. It is also an essential component of fairness.

This Board works very hard at eliminating bias and prejudice. One of the ways that Board members do this is through the process of recusal. Board members recuse themselves in enforcement cases in which they know the psychologist who is accused of wrongdoing.

Personally, it has been easy the decision to recuse myself but hard to watch from the sidelines.

I have seen several enforcement cases involving people I know and respect. This is very difficult. Yet, while the human tendency is to help a friend, the legal and just action is to stay away from every aspect of the case. The case must stand or fall on its own merits.

But why not make an exception for me? We cannot and will not because to make an exception for one is to discredit the very system of justice and fairness we hold dear.

It is true there are some areas of law related to psychology that allow for discretion. In these areas, it is appropriate to develop well-reasoned policy. The policy regarding each decision must be clear public and applied uniformly. When this occurs the Board's actions are predictable and understandable, though not always popular.

Why can't you make an exception for me? Because, fairness, justice, equality, even-handedness, predictability and the law would not be served, and we would not be doing our job of making safe the profession of psychology.

*The California Board of Psychology protects the safety and welfare of consumers of psychological services.*



## Staff Members

**Robert Kahane, J.D.,**  
Executive Officer

**Jeffrey Thomas,**  
Assistant Executive Officer

**Gina Bayless,**  
Enforcement Coordinator

**Julie Brown,**  
Enforcement Analyst

**Deborah Morales,**  
Enforcement Analyst

**Denise Russell,**  
Continuing Education/  
Probation Coordinator

**Lavinia F. Snyder,**  
Licensing/Registration  
Program Coordinator

**Annette Parino,**  
Licensing/Registration  
Analyst

**Karen Johnson,**  
Licensing/Registration  
Analyst

**Valerie Riazzi,**  
Licensing/Registration  
Analyst

**Linda Kassis,**  
Administrative Services  
Coordinator

**Tammy Bailey,**  
Licensing Technician

**Diana Crosby,**  
Administrative Technician

**Kimberly Young,**  
Office Technician





# Colleague to Colleague: Doing Diligence for Our Clients, Ourselves, and Our Profession

*The Board of Psychology (Board) is committed to including guest articles in the BOP Update. The Board of Psychology takes no responsibility for the accuracy or veracity of any comments or statements contained in a guest article, and the Board remains neutral on any position statements made in a guest article.*

## INTRODUCTION

It has taken a paradigm shift for our profession, and for us as psychologists, to appreciate that working from a framework of prevention/self-care will allow more psychologists to sustain wellness and to better navigate challenges when they do occur. Never before have psychologists, and especially California psychologists, had such professionally appropriate and research-based options (we are currently analyzing data from a study with APA on Colleague Assistance Programs, CAPs) for accessing assistance.

## HISTORY

In 2001, (Barnett & Hillard) 41 of 59 associations reported not having a CAP. 10 of the 41, or 24% reported a program in the past. 70% stated underutilization as the primary reason for discontinuation. Deutsch (1985) listed top reasons for lack of use as: lack of resources; fear of professional exposure or censoring; and the belief that one should be able to work out problems on their own. More recently, Siebert & Siebert (2007) view the matter as an issue of role identity. They found that being in the helping profession reduced the tendency to seek assistance.

## CURRENT STATUS

The shift from a primary focus on impaired psychologists, specifically those with substance abuse impairment, led to normalizing the concept that psychologists (like all people) have challenges and perhaps are at even greater risk given the inherent stressors in our profession. To combat the earlier barriers, an emphasis on prevention was a hallmark initiated by the California Psychological Association's Colleague Assistance & Support Program (CLASP) in 2005 which has led the way for a sensitive, ethical model of reform. CLASP fully appreciates that the continuum of stress-

to-distress- to-impairment is very real and intervention at the earliest point is the most valuable approach. By emphasizing a self-care model our colleagues are more open to using the confidential 24-hour call-in line, (888-262-8293) or visiting the frequently cited CLASP Web site, [www.cpaclasp.org](http://www.cpaclasp.org).

## INNOVATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS

CLASP's unique approach of viewing both the professional and personal needs of psychologists, across the developmental spectrum from graduate student/early career phase through the retirement years, has influenced CAPs throughout the country. Specifically, Bridgeman (2009) has developed a spectrum derived informal assessment that captures professional/personal preventive and self-care approaches; Beckerman's (2005) programs and materials on collaborative consultation are another unique example. A much needed 22-page toolkit, which also captures a continuum framework, is now available for all psychologists and CAPs (Bridgeman, 2010).

CLASP was spurred on by the reminder of Principle A of our APA Ethics Code, which states that we are to be aware of the effect of own physical and mental health on our ability to help those we serve, (APA, 2002, p.3). This has propelled CLASP to honor our moral imperative to our colleagues, clients, and professional guild. CLASP continues to explore unique ways to undo the still existing stigma of help-seeking, and to promote prevention and the development of resilient-like protective factors that not only aid us in coping with significant issues but inoculate us as we navigate ongoing challenges before they become impairments.

Diane Bridgeman, Ph.D., *Co-Chair, CPA CLASP Committee; Chair, APA Advisory Committee on Colleague Assistance*

Dani Beckerman, Psy.D.,  
*Co-Chair, CPA CLASP Committee*

Jo Linder-Crow, Ph.D., *CPA Executive Director*



## Disciplinary Actions

FEBRUARY 2009-SEPTEMBER 2010

### Notice:

The following decisions become operative on the effective date except in situations where the licensee obtains a court-ordered stay, which may occur after the publication of this newsletter. For updated information on stay orders and appeals, you may telephone (916) 263-2691 and speak to the Board's Enforcement Analyst.

To order copies of these decisions and other documents, send your written request by mail or e-mail the Board's at [bopmail@dca.ca.gov](mailto:bopmail@dca.ca.gov). Include the name and license number of the licensee and send to the attention of the Enforcement Program at the Board's Sacramento offices. Please note that there is a minimal copying charge for these documents.

### West, Richard D., (PSB 34160)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(a). Stipulated Decision effective February 9, 2009. Upon registration as a Psychological Assistant, registration will be revoked, stayed, 5 years probation. Registration issued on February 9, 2009.

### Rocha-Singh, Indra A., Ph.D., (PSY 15940)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(j). Stipulated Decision effective March 27, 2009. License revoked, stayed, 7 years probation.

### Betz, Brian P., Ph.D., (PSY 16035)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(j). Stipulated Decision effective April 11, 2009. License revoked, stayed, suspension, 5 years probation.

### Coyne, Paul D., Ph.D., (PSY 7144)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(j). Stipulated Decision effective April 2, 2009. License surrendered.

### Lore, John R., Ph.D., (PSY 14270)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(o). Stipulated Decision effective April 2, 2009. License surrendered.

### Gray, Gloria M. Ph.D., (PSY 6683)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(o). Stipulated Decision effective April 2, 2009. License surrendered.

### Ravicz, Simone, Ph.D., (PSY 15512)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(b). Stipulated Decision effective March 18, 2009. License surrendered.

### Scorse, David M. (PSB 34922) (PSB 34229)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(n). Proposed Decision effective March 18, 2009. Upon registration as a Psychological Assistant, registration will be revoked, stayed, 5 years probation. Registration issued on January 26, 2010.

### Rand, Randy, Ed.D., (PSY 12137)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960. Proposed Decision effective June 28, 2009. License revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

### Herrera, Arnold E. Ph.D., (PSY 6102)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code

§2960(a). Stipulated Decision effective August 1, 2009. License surrendered.

### Mendoza, Jaime E., (Applicant)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(a). Proposed Decision effective August 13, 2009. Upon application as a psychologist, license granted, revoked, stayed, 6 years probation.

### Kaiser, Henry M., (Applicant)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(n). Proposed Decision effective September 30, 2009.

Upon registration as a Psychological Assistant, registration will be revoked, stayed, 6 years probation.

### Vodhanel, Lois, Ph.D., (PSY 14646)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(a). Stipulated Decision effective September 30, 2009. License revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

### Hibbard, Kristin, Ph.D., (PSY 19414)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(n). Default Decision effective November 20, 2009. License revoked.

### Reynolds, Lisa M., (Applicant)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(a). Decision effective November 21, 2009. Upon registration as a Psychological Assistant, registration will be revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

### Gillispie, Joanie F., Ph.D., (PSY 16728)

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(j). Stipulated Decision effective November 27, 2009. License surrendered.



## *Disciplinary Actions* from previous page

**Belanger, Joseph T., Ph.D., (PSY 10798)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(m). Default Decision effective December 31, 2009. License revoked.

**Ramirez-Estrada, Sonny, (PSB 34999)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960. Decision effective March 6, 2010. Upon registration as a Psychological Assistant, registration will be revoked, stayed, 4 years probation.

**Howell, Alane M., Ph.D., (PSY 12102)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(j). Stipulated Decision effective March 27, 2010. License revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

**Millsap-Simec, Tracy Psy.D., (Applicant)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960. Stipulated Decision effective April 2, 2010. Upon registration as a Psychological Assistant, registration will be revoked, stayed, 3 years probation.

**Ochs, Len, Ph.D. (PSY 12119)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960. Stipulated Decision Effective April 28, 2010. License surrendered.

**Haapanen, Randy M., Ph.D., (PSY 5845)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(j). Stipulated Decision effective May 27, 2010. License revoked, stayed, 3 years probation.

**Sanchez, Frank A. (Applicant)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960. Stipulated Decision effective June 10, 2010. Upon registration as a

Psychological Assistant, registration will be revoked, stayed, 3 years probation.

**Bunce, Jon Stanley, Ph.D., (PSY 10265)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960 (j). Proposed Decision effective 7/21/10. License revoked.

**Weathers, Robert, Ph.D. (PSY 9966)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(o). Stipulated Decision effective 8/11/10. License surrendered.

**Roberson, Kenneth R., Ph.D. (PSY 11958)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960. Stipulated Decision effective 8/27/10. License revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

**Saindon, Chris, Ph.D. (PSY 20141)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(a). Stipulated Decision effective 9/17/10. License revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

**Rubin, Barton Harris, Ph.D. (PSY 11017)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(n) Stipulated Decision effective 9/24/10. License revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

**Sillemon, Anthony, Psy.D. (Unlicensed)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960. Proposed Decision effective 9/24/10. Upon registration as a Psychological Assistant, registration will be revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

**DeVincent, John, Psy.D. (PSY 21016)**

Found to be in violation of B&P Code §2960(b). Stipulated Decision effective 9/25/10. License revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

### Explanation of Disciplinary Language

**REVOKED**

The license is canceled, voided, annulled, or rescinded. The right to practice is ended.

**REVOKED, STAYED, PROBATION**

“Stayed” means the revocation is postponed or put off. Professional practice may continue so long as the licensee complies with specific probationary terms and conditions. Violation of probation may result in the revocation that was postponed.

**SUSPENSION**

The licensee is prohibited from practicing for a specific period of time.

**GROSS NEGLIGENCE**

An extreme departure from the standard of practice.

**DEFAULT DECISION**

Licensee fails to respond to Accusation by filing a Notice of Defense or fails to appear at administrative hearing.

**LICENSE SURRENDER**

While charges are still pending, the licensee turns in the license, subject to acceptance by the Board. The right to practice is ended.

**EFFECTIVE DECISION DATE**

The date the disciplinary decision goes into effect.